

Joint George Mason/Mary Ellen Henderson Campus Steering Committee

MINUTES

AUGUST 14, 2014

7:30AM

CITY HALL – DOGWOOD ROOM

IN ATTENDANCE	
	David Tarter, Mayor (DT) David Snyder, Vice Mayor (DS) Susan Kearney, School Board Chair (SK) John Lawrence, School Board Member (JL) Ruth Rodgers, Planning Commission Chair (RR) Michael Novotny, EDA (MN) Wyatt Shields, City Manager (WS) Toni Jones, Superintendent of Schools (TJ)
OTHERS PARTICIPATING	<div style="background-color: black; width: 150px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Susan Bell, Consultant (SB) Doug McCoach, RTKL (DM) (remote)
DOCUMENTS/ RESOURCES	
INVITED GUESTS	RTKL – Doug McCoach,

Agenda

2A:	RTKL Interim Presentation via WebX
2B:	Election of Committee Chairs
2C:	Set Agenda for 8/21/14 meeting
2D:	Update on ULI/TAP

Discussion and Recommendations (By Speaker)

Agenda	Speaker	
2A	DM	Presentation of Interim Findings via WebX.
Questions to RTKL	DS	What are the differences and what does it mean that only 2 floors and 8 floors were presented? Are there options between 2 and 8 to consider? Parking – seems to be too high for school use only, and seems to need to tie in to future commercial use. Fields – how feasible is it that they are on top of structures as presented? Pleased to see there are potentially two commercially developable locations. Is UVa / VaTech in this project or not? Just a future consideration/question.
	MN	Construction phasing is most critical based on options presented today. How realistic is it to build a co-located campus (MS and HS together)? Distances to metro should be shown as walking paths in linear feet, not as the crow flies. On an ongoing, long-term basis, higher density closer to the metro would be higher transaction value and higher ongoing value. Shared parking garage with UVa idea, how can we express alternatives that capitalize there? Could we improve the one-way access road to be two-way with traffic signals?
	SK	The project asked for bookends in terms of how much and how little school space was needed so the 8 and 2 floor options are appropriate bookends but feels that a vertical building is absolutely appropriate. Encouraged that we can actually meet the school program on 70% of the land.
	RR	How many things are "locked in"? Mentioned pool, parking, tennis structures.
	DM	Response to RR – this is an exploration exercise. Those are identified program pieces and the options show ways they can fit.
	SK	Response to RR - These are really community choices that still need to be made, not simply school choices.
	MN	The relevance of shared parking with UVa is important because it unlocks more land on our site.
	RR	The 1,500 student capacity – is that a maximum? Shared outdoor space between schools is a concern.
	TJ	Response to RR - 1500 students is a current projection but can change based on current and future development projects in the City.
	DT	This is a long-term 50 or 100 year project so existing (old) roads shouldn't constrain our thinking today. He would like to see options that require changing ingress and egress and traffic patterns. Do we have a survey of easements and other encumbrances? Recommend to the group that we engage that survey if it does not exist. He would encourage RTKL to show even more options that show 30% available for commercial

		development. He agrees the parking is over what is needed. Parcel 109A continues to show up in the presentation. Recommends removing any reference to it.
	DS	There are still enough questions regarding the school site that RTKL should continue to work on those aspects. For instance 2 v 8, parking, etc. Next steps should focus strictly the school element.
	MN	Agrees with DS.
	SK	Recommends RTKL come to next meeting to review comments made today.
	DS	Task staff, EDA and Planning to determine what additional expertise is needed.
	SK	How do we re-engage UVa/VaTech?
2B		Nominations from floor. SK and DT to be co-chairs. – Motion (DS), second (JL), approved 6-0.
2C	DS	Recommend co-signed letter (by Chairs) to UVa/VaTech to invite them into the discussion.
	WS	He will follow up with UVa/VaTech.
	DT	Can we invite them to next Thursday's meeting?
	MN	Have we had a full legal review of the lease?
	DT	Get costs and procurement process information for survey (ALTA).
	JL	Should we also invite member of Foust's staff to next Thursday?
	SK	JL will invite member of Foust's staff.
	TJ	Future meeting schedule and projects list.
	JL	Next meeting will not be in closed session.
	WS	Procedural steps for expenditures of funds, requiring approval of both CC and SB prior to expenditures.
2D	SB	Update on ULI/TAP Briefing Book preparation. Should be available for SC review in early September.
	DS	Wants to clarify that we do not have a preferred model of "commercial", limited to "mixed use" and wants ULI/TAP to explore a much broader definition of "commercial".

Action Items

Item	Assigned to:	Date Assigned
Develop additional "review" / approve language options for operating procedures.	WS/TJ	7/14/14
Contact UVa/VaTech and engage them by inviting to 8/21/14 meeting.	WS	8/14/14
Determine additional expertise needed (commercial, transportation, etc).	CITY STAFF	8/14/14
Invite Supervisor Foust (or staff) to attend 8/21/14 meeting.	JL	8/14/14
Commission ALTA Survey	CITY STAFF	8/14/14

Task Completed In Progress From Previous Meetings

Potential Action Items (Discussed, not designated)

Item	Assigned to:	Delivery